DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 101 539 FL 005 691

AUTHOR Lawton, Ben
TITLE The Effective Audio-Visual Program in Foreign Language and Literature Studies.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Audiovisual Instruction; College Language Programs; Film Libraries; *Film Study; *Foreign Language Films; *Language Instruction; *Modern Language Curriculum; Second Language Learning; Semiotics; Video Tape Recordings

ABSTRACT

Foreign language teachers should exploit the American affinity for television and movies by using foreign language feature films and shorts in the classroom. Social and political history and literary trends illustrated in the films may be discussed and absorbed along with the language. The author teaches such a course in the Department of Italian at UCLA, for which shorts and features were obtained from the Italian Consulate and the Instituto Italiano di Cultura, often free of charge. The discipline of semiotics analyzes the communicative value of signs and classifies them as arbitrary (as in written language), iconic (in visual language), or indexic (qualified iconic signs). The instructor may use the iconic and indexic signs in a film to teach the arbitrary signs, or vocabulary, of the foreign language. The second section of this paper deals with the teaching of film as literature. Methods of stylistic analysis used for written literature may be applied to film to increase understanding and research into this art form. (CK)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ED101539

The effective audio-visual program in foreign language and literature studies

When I first spoke to Jules Mandel, the Foreign Language Advisor for the Los Angeles Unified School District, about the idea of using film in the teaching of languages and literatures, he asked me if it could demonstrably improve the skills of the students. "Of course, I answered, "it's simply a process of directing an existing interest." Not satisfied, Mr. Mandel repeated his question, and emphasized his primary concern: "Can you prove that the use of film will improve the skills of our students ... and if so, how?" Once again I answered. "Sure ... with the usual tests ..."

It may well have been that upon that occasion as in many others I allowed myself to be carried away by my enthusiasm for a new idea. Particularly where the teaching of foreign languages is concerned there are still many difficulties to be resolved --most of which I hope are simply technical in nature.

As our technology has evolved from the quill to the printing press to the more contemporary audio-visual systems, it has always produced an immense impact and has given immense power to those who have mastered and/or controlled it. It should suffice to remember the old saying that "the pen is mightier than the sword," but were it not sufficient --or passé-- we have but to observe the influence both contemporary cinema and television have on us all.

FL005 691

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

More specifically, what is the most didactic purpose of audio-visual communications? I fear it is not PBS' Humanities Forum or the seven o'clock news. Obviously it's television commercials. It seems that, on the average, we look at between three and four hours of television each day of the week, and American businessmen and politicians spend millions of dollars to capture our hearts and wallets. We learn to love the taste we hate twice a day (it's so bad it has to be good for us, right?), and that chocolate flavored vitamins are good for the kids (or was it Mommy?), and that once we are safe, sure, unstained, unstung, unwet, and cool, we must put our money where our mouth is if we wish to make it with --oh joy!-- the pilot or the cheerleader. All of this of course, only if our kitchen sink nose and our plastic septic tank stomach aren't producing that particular stuffiness or ache number umptynine, curable most effectively only with product A (and our tests prove conclusively that it is far better than B, C, and D!).

Well, we're not so smelly as our forefathers, and that, I guess, is good (apparently it was noticeable even to their somewhat desensitized noses ...), but I think most of us would tend to agree that, by and large, the audio-visual media are not being used in a manner most favorable to those concerns which are closest to the educator's heart.

The effective audio-visual program today must be seen as including, at a minimum, slides and filmstrips with accompanying records and/or tapes, films and video-tapes, for reasons which will become apprent as we proceed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is, I believe, an established fact that people of all ages will spend an inordinate number of hours at the movies or in front of the television set. The "interest," in other words, exists. I said "interest", but perhaps "presence" might be a better term in that we, as amorphous mass, tend to prefer the more stupidifying experiences --not for nothing is television called the "boob tube"-- and when we do go to the movies, we patronize what from an artistic/literary standpoint is almost invariably trash.

Prof. Hart Wagner of the University of Nevada, speaking at the Fall Conference of the Foreign Language Association of Northern California held at the University of California, Berkeley, on October 13, 1973, suggested that this "interest" be exploited, that through the use of feature films in class --not documentaries, travelogues, etc.-- we can in some way convey something about a culture, about literature, and that, if we use foreign films in the original,and block out the subtitles and have access to the scripts, it is possible to teach the language in question.

Suggestions such as these may have some validity ... if you don't have the problems I run into every time I mention the unmentionable around my Department: <u>money!</u> However, before I begin to discuss the latter, and before I attempt to consider somewhat concretely the relations between literature and film and, hopefully, even more concretely some of the ways in which audio-visual media can be used in the teaching of foreign languages, let us consider the simplest item on the agenda: film and culture.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Prof. Wagner also stated, correctly enough, that feature films which "present culture, not ... show indirect statements on culture" are infinitely more interesting to students than the more available shorts. He is unquestionably correct in his assessment of the relative interest factor inherent to the two genres. The fact is, however, that his primary concern was the attraction of more students into foreign language studies at the college level --and thus the kind of program he envisions may not be possible at the High School level.

The use of feature films is possible virtually only in service courses taught in translation, for it is only the latter which furnish the numbers of students necessary to justify the expenditure implicit in such a course.

The Department of Italian at UCLA is currently offering such a course three times a year for the second year. While it is virtually impossible to predict the exact enrollments, the class has grown constantly and last quarter I had to divide the 230 students who took the course into three sections. In many ways, however, I was fortunate. Different individuals and organizations, who wish to remain anonymous, made films available to me the first time the course was offered and, through the energy and activity of Prof. Giovanni Cecchetti, the Department Chairman, funding (about $500 per quarter) was made available for subsequent courses.

The course is entitled: Literary and Socio-Political Trends in Italian Cinema. The socio-political aspects, that is those which deal with the culture, the heritage of Italy, are, as may be expected, the easiest to deal with.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In essence, Italians discuss, through film, problems which have obsessed Italians since the time of Dante: the heritage of Rome, the presence and influence of the Church, the tendency towards anarchy, the "art of living" (also defined as amoral familism and qualunquismo), etc.

What are the effects of such a course, where the Department is concerned? At the most basic of levels, a large number of students are coming to realize that film need not be only an escapist medium, that the "world" --to use a G.I. expression-- is not limited to the continental United States, that something has actually happened in Italy since the days of The Agony and the Ecstasy (a.k.a. the Renaissance). More specifically they are coming to learn that, by and large, the more serious studies of film are simply not available in English, and that if they wish to go beyond the most superficial plot outlines, they must know at least Italian and French. They are also being exposed to the various professors in the Department --individuals whose reputation as scholars is worldwide, but who, because they usually teach more advanced courses, are unknown to the vast majority of the students.

Does this mean that the school or university which does not have substantial resources cannot engage in such activities? Not necessarily. Prof. Wagner suggests asking the students for "donations." While feasible, it is, at least at UCLA, illegal, and therefore --if such is the case in your school-- to be considered with ... discretion.

Other alternatives do exist, however. The shorts, as I mentioned earlier, are more easily available. Los Angeles may by its very nature as large metropolis, endanger our lungs and our sanity, but, by its very

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

nature it also ensures the presence of the Consulates and of the airlines of virtually every country in the world. Both of these usually have a considerable number of films available, or can get them if pressured sufficiently. Furthemore, it is usually possible to get a limited number of feature films, usually in the original, from the Ministry of Culture or of Entertainment of the given country. In the case of Italy, the Istituto Italiano di Cultura, under the direction of Prof. Giuseppe Cardillo, has furnished us with both shorts and feature films on a regular basis. As a matter of fact they have several catalogs of films, tapes, records, etc., which they make available upon request. And, most importantly, they will furnish all these materials completely free of charge (You only pay for return postage).

Now let us assume you have obtained a series of shorts. Having previewed them you have discovered that, for the most part they are simplistic glorified advertisments for the country, done largely by incompetents, or massively boring technical analises of the defeat of the malarial mosquito. What do you do with them?

a) In the bluntest of terms you use them as didactic tools, not as work avoidance devices. This notion is of primary importance regardless of the kind of film you have available to you (I have discovered, for example, that unless compelled to do so, thirty per cent of the students in my course will not appear to see films such as Satyricon, The Garden of the Finzi-Continis, Eight and a Half, Red Desert, Juliet of the Spirits, etc., while they will glaily spend three dollars to see them in a theater.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I have also discovered, by answering University questionnaires, that I spend about sixty hours a week on the film course).

2) As a rule students will adopt whatever attitude is manifested by the instructor. I will be specific. The Department of Italian instituted a cultural supplement to its lower level language courses. This program, taught in Italian, makes use of a wide range of audio-visual tools including short films. The response of the students has varied in direct relation to the amount of effort, enthusiasm, and seriousness manifested by the different instructors who have run this program. If you act negatively in relation to the material available, your students will respond in kind. Conversely, however, if you actively demand that they extract from the shorts the material you feel is pertinent, and which you will introduce and integrate as you feel best, the response will be positive. However, particularly where shorts are concerned, since as a rule they are not intrinsically interesting or entertaining, you must find a "hook", an "angle" which will render them such. Allow me to exemplify. A couple of years ago we received a film concerning the ENI, the para-governmental organization which controls much of Italian industry, from telephones and televisions, to Alitalia, to Alfa Romeo, and to the oil industry. Per se, the film was at best less interesting than Love Story, to put it mildly. The ENI, however, is actively involved in rebuilding the south of Italy, a subject which is immediately vastly more interesting than the film itself. Why does the South require rebuilding? What is its history? What are the differences between

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

southern and northern Italians (on all levels, racial, linguistic, etc.)? does the mafia really exist? why did it originate? why is the South often considered a colony of the North? etc. Suddenly you are dealing with issues that are of immediate interest, and can offer the student a framework through which to see his own world from a different perspective.

As I was saying, however, it is you who must find the angle, through an immersion in readings concerning all aspects of the country's past and present.

Good. Now, having at this point shown a short concerning the FIAT in Torino, you have excited the students by revealing the parallels which exist between the immigration of southern Italians to the industrialized North and the ever evolving process of urbanization in the United States: or, having shown a short concerning the goldsmiths of Florence, you have regaled your students with tales of the adventures of Benvenuto Cellini.

Great. However, you are being paid to teach them Italian, and not only to entertain them(which by now, through your reinterpretation of of the material has become rather easy..) How do you use the shorts (or feature films) to teach a foreign language?

Particularly where shorts are concerned, you will find that most available films are neither dubbed nor subtitled (the uses of the latter types are still being investigated and will be discussed at some other time). The dialogue or commentary in the film may be used as a quasi living example of the manner in which the upper middle class speaks, through a combination of what will seem like endless repetitions and the transcription of the narration or dialogue.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This, however, is both the easiest and at the same time the most difficult use to which film may be put. The most difficult in that it is the most inaccessible to the beginning language student. The easiest, in that it is the most conventional.

Film, however, lends itself to another level of linguistic interpretation heretofore generally ignored in the teaching of foreign languages. It has often been said that a picture is worth a thousand words. Use them! The relatively new 'science' of semiology, or semiotics is concerned with the communicative value of signs. Originally employed to analyse signs in written/spoken languages, its use has now been extended to consider film, painting, sculpture, etc.

Although the terminology employed varies, as do the theories, as a general rule it is felt that signs are divided into three categories: arbitrary, indexic and iconic. Signs in written/spoken languages are, by and large, arbitrary: it is through an arbitrary convention that we are the sign man, mann, hombre, homme, muschina or uomo to describe something which in a general sort of way resembles me more than a horse or a train. An iconic sign, conversely, is more proper to visual languages. If I were on film, you would presumably describe me at the most basic of levels by saying, man, mann, hombre, homme, muschina or uomo, I hope. Indexic signs seem to be qualified iconic signs in visual languages. If I were stumbling around dressed in white bell-bottoms, with short hair and a white cap, you might say: "a drunken sailor."

At this point you can start mining the short for its lexical content, and even if you are a native speaker, you may discover, as I did, the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

limitations of your vocabulary. Each single frame will, almost without exception, be so filled with iconic signs (images = potential words) as to boggle the mind. Furthermore, by considering them in their action, or in the absence thereof, you have at your disposal a plethora of verbs. As a matter of fact, in the same way in which we translate "reality" into written/spoken languages, we may translate the language of film, and thus we have at our disposal every grammatical-syntactical point we could possibly wish to make. Finally, it is simple enough to establish a convention with the students in order to remedy those deficiencies which may appear in a given film, or which are inherent to the language itself. More specifically, if I need to teach uomini (men), and all I have on the screen is a uomo (man), it is sufficient to say "un uomo" while pointing at the screen, and then say, "due ... ! indicating the number two with your fingers.

A slightly more serious problem exists where verbs are concerned. The language of film, as a general rule, expresses only the third persons, singular and plural, of the present indicative. Once again, however, through a convention with the students, this problem can be overcome. You might, for example, ask them to describe the action on the screen (third pers. sing. or plur.), to speak to the images on the screen (second pers. sing. or plur.), or identify with the images in describing the action (first pers. sing. or plur.). You may also ask them to express the action in the indicative present, past, future, in the imperative, in the subjunctive or what have you. In other words, it would seem possible to employ any drills you might employ in written/spoken languages, as well as teach any grammatical point. Furthermore,

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

not only will you be able to completely bypass the transition from arbitrary sign (word) to arbitrary sign (word) in going from one language to another (man = uomo), but the arbitrary sign (word) in the new language will be more forcefully implanted in the student's brain in that its point of reference is the iconic sign (image).

At this point it should be apparent that the instructor may employ prepared audio-visual materials of all kinds (video-tapes, films, slides, filmstrips) in the same manner, or even prepare his own (it has been my experience that the process of actually "doing something", particularly in any area of film making --here obviously on the economy plan-- always stimulates students to produce what is occasionally rather impressive work).

Having waxed enthusiastic till this point, I should add a couple of caveats. The ideal usage of the visual language of film requires the possibility of still-framing, a feature which is available on most 16mm film projectors and on most reel to reel video-tape recorders. The problem is that extended still framing can be deleterious to both film and video-tape, and should therefore be done only within the safety limits of the given equipment.

The question at this point is: "do you eliminate the written language?" Obviously not. In speaking earlier of the most extensive use of audio-visual media for didactic purposes I referred to television advertising. Almost without exception the images presented include words, which serve to reinforce whatever action is presented. The visual language in fact, can at best only try to convey a concept. The only way an abstract concept can be presented visually is through the written language. If you show

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

two people kissing or fighting, the visual language simply reveals that they are kissing or fighting, and it is the spectator who must extrapolate the notions of love or hate. At a simpler level, since it is assumed that most people who are studying a foreign language can read and write, it is not necessary to require that they revert to a pre-literate level or that they readopt ideograms as their written language. The written language will instead furnish arbitrary phonic and conceptual memoranda (words) which refer to the iconic signs (images) of the object, rather than to another arbitrary phonic/conceptual sign.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Film as Literature

Having made a number of suggestions concerning the usage of audio-visual media in the teaching of Foreign Languages --suggestions which are deliberately quite varied, so that you may adopt the method or methods which best suit your practical and psychological needs (according to a recent article in the Los Angeles Times, teachers, along with athletes, policemen, actors, lawyers, etc., tend to be highly individualistic and to thrive on danger)-- I would like to propose a couple of suggestions concerning the teaching of literature through film.

Before I proceed, two basic assumptions must be established.

1) When I speak of literature in this context, I employ it as a synonym for Prof. Cecchetti's definition of poetry: any artistic manifestation of mankind.

2) By the analysis of literature, I refer to Prof. Chiappelli's stylistic approach according to which the causes for any response elicited in the individual by the work must be found in the work.

These premises are particularly necessary if we wish to be able to seriously undertake a literary analysis of film.

While I am not necessarily conversant with all the different ways in which film is being currently studied --the discipline is still in a period of considerable individualism (confusion?)-- I think the following approaches represent the major trends:

1) Film production studies;

2) Film as social, political, ethnic, cultural, psychological documentation;

3) Film and literature;

4) Film as literature.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

While all these approaches may interest us, I feel we should be concerned primarily with the study of film as literature. The difference between film and literature and film as literature must be emphasized. There is an ever increasing interest in the study of film the world over, and, for many reasons, today, at least in universities from Prague to Santa Barbara, the primary concern is not with production, but rather with finding a humanistic approach to film, through which to arrive at a definition of its artistic essence.

The two most common approaches in this sense are:

1) in Europe, the semiological or semiotic study of film, which in many instances --Bettetini, for example, at the University of Milan-- is reduced to a scientific-linguistic analysis of film;

2) in the United States, the study of literature and film; that is a study of the literary influences, themes, and even rhetorical devices present in film. There is, for example, considerable interest in the comparative study of the novel and film.

The problem, obviously, is, how does one go about comparing a novel, expressed in a written/spoken language, and film, expressed in a totally different language(the former represents reality, while the latter reproduces segments of it)?

The most obvious comparison --or differentiation-- will appear through a study of the relative plot outlines. Today, however, no one is really interested in what is commonly known as content. The artistic quality of a work is determined by its form. As a matter of fact, we are told that form is content! But, then, what is form?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In the simplest of terms, I think, I hope, we can agree that form is the choice and arrangement of given expressive devices. In dealing with the general theme, boy meets girl and, inevitably, troubles ensue, Dante, Boccaccio, Machiavelli, Manzoni, Pirandello, and Moravia have, as we all know, chosen different words and ordered them differently in order to express their differing perception of the event. If we consider the films of Rossellini, De Sica, Visconti, Antonioni, Fellini, Pasolini, Bellocchio, and Bertolucci, we will see that the same premise will hold true.

The fact is, however, that while it is relatively easy to identify the "parole" --the individual style of a given writer through a conscious comparison with the "normal" structure of the "language"-- this has been considerably more difficult where film is concerned until very recently. We have, in other words, heard different critics speak of realism, metarealism, lyricism, poetry, etc. in film. What do these expressions mean? Is it possible to arrive at a concrete definition of these terms? Can we concretely identify in a film those elements which will enable us to say of it, "Yes, this film is realistic," or, "Yes, this other film is metarealistic."

At the simplest of levels, André Bazin (the famous French film critic) suggests that a realistic film is one in which the director is proficient in the handling of the illusion of reality. Conversely then, we might suggest that a meta-realistic film is one in which the director is proficient in handling the illusion of subjective, internal reality. Parenthetically, it might be added that the reason for which Bazin speaks of the illusion of reality is predicated quite simply on the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

fact that film is not the reality it reproduces. By definition, film is limited in space and time. The choice of subject matter, the physical limitations of the camera lens, the duration of the shot, all impose a subjective limitation on the virtually limitless reality which surrounds us in space and time. We are all, however, capable of distinguishing in a general sort of way between the objective fact --for example my presence here-- and our subjective response to the event --I may lend my presence here a significance vastly different from that which you attribute to it. In the same manner, we are capable of distinguishing between a neo-realistic film --Rome, open city, --or Umberto D., to mention a film recently shown on PBS' Humanities Forum-- and a metarealistic film such as Juliet of the Spirits or Eight and a Half.

The original question, however, still remains unanswered. What are the expressive devices which differentiate the two styles?

It has already been suggested in the discussion of the use of film in language instruction that the various objects reproduced on the screen can be said to compose the vocabulary of the language of film. It is a virtually limitless vocabulary, as are the objects themselves; it is an extremely specific vocabulary --a tree does not exist in the language of film, it must be a pear tree or a pine tree or a cherry tree, etc., except as a result of the viewer's limitations-- and it is a vocabulary whose nouns are always qualified --the pear tree will be young, old, yellow, green, big, little, etc. Furthermore, as was also suggested, the positioning of the objects in the frame and/or in relation to each other will allow

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a preliminary grammatical/syntactical analysis. Finally, the editing process --that is the juxtaposition of different shots-- will permit a further examination of the gramma/syntax.

Given these premises, how does one go about determining if these devices are employed in a realistic or metarealistic manner?

Pasolini suggests that there are two types of qualifiers in the language of film:

1) Profilmic qualifiers;

2) Filmic qualifiers.

Pasolini defines profilmic qualifiers as those actions and choices operated upon the objects to be filmed before they are filmed. He is,in other words, speaking of the choice of objects to be filmed, modifications operated upon them (make-up, paint, etc.), their relative positioning, the choice of lighting, etc. In speaking of filmic qualifiers, Pasolini is referring to those choices and actions operated upon the camera in the act of filming. By this he means the choice of camera angle, the type of lens used, the use of static shots, dolly shots, tracking shots, panning shots, zoom lens shots, etc.

It might thus be argued that while the vocabulary, grammar and syntax as "language" are content, they are also "parole", or form, in that the director --if he is serious about his his work, will be internally coherent in his employment of both filmic and profilmic qualifiers. Pasolini adds that in terms of filmic qualifiers we can arrive at our first distinction between prose cinema and poetic cinema. I personally am not convinced by Pasolini's terminology in this instance. In reality the distinction will be between objective, realistic cinema and subjective, metarealistic cinema. Pasolini himself argues elsewhere that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the language of film is inherently poetic, and that attempts at using it for prosaic purposes require that external elements be imposed upon it. In the simplest of terms, prose attempts to explain in a logical fashion our perceptions of reality, while poetry will attempt to express what may be the same perceptions on a level which more closely approximates our intuitive response to the event. The nature of the language of film requires that the images and their juxtapositions express the artist's perception of reality. This poetic nature of the language was perverted with the advent of sound in film --because most directors attempted to explain the images through the use of dialogue or commentary. Fortunately, over the years, the better directors have realized that sound is simply one more of the component elements of the reality to be reproduced, and therefore have used it as such. We might therefore argue, following Pasolini's method, but changing the terminology, that if the action before the passive camera is emphasized, the film will be realistic, and the director's faith in objective reality is expressed. Conversely, if the active camera work itself is emphasized, the director's subjective, lyrical, metarealistic vision of reality will be accentuated. The realistic film will, in other words, as was suggested earlier, attempt to handle the illusion of reality; i.e.: through an accentuation of the action in front of the camera an attempt will be made to cause the viewer to forget that he is witnessing a film and accept, at least temporarily, what is happening as reality. Conversely, the metarealistic film will distort the normal audio-visual perception of the event in order to cause the viewer to be aware of the fact that he is witnessing a subjective expresion of reality.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

In this manner, at the simplest of levels, a first concrete distinction can be made between Rome, open city and Umberto D. --two neo-realistic films-- and Eight and a Half and Juliet of the Spirits --two metarealistic films. As a matter of fact, in this manner we can even begin to distinguish, in terms of form, between Rome, open city (early neo-realism, 1945) and Umberto D. (late neo-realism, 1951), in that in the latter we find that the protagonists suicidal impulse to leap from his window to the cobblestones below is conveyed through the use of an active filmic qualifier, a zoom lens shot, which emphasizes the subjective, lyrical point of view. We have, in other words, been permitted a first glimpse of the protagonists subjective perception of reality as opposed to the more traditional exposition or explanation of the event.

These same criteria may obviously be applied to profilmic qualifiers. De Sica lost a financial backer for Bicycle Thieves because he refused to cast Cary Grant as the protagonist of the film. The director was searching for someone who would be his protagonist: an unemployed, desperate manual laborer. And it was an unemployed manual laborer whom he finally chose. The non-actor in this case was deliberately chosen in order that he be true to the objective, physical and perhaps even psychological reality of the personage. To this we may compare Fellini's choices in Satyricon. Here, the people we see on the screen no longer in any way resemble or reproduce an objective reality, but rather they are caricatures of themselves; in other words they reveal to us that subjective vision of reality which has been called the Fellinian

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

universe.

And again, these criteria may be applied to an analysis of the editing in a film. In the simplest of terms, if the succession of shots before us is primarily informative, it is considered to be denotative, and emphasizes an objective reality. If on the other hand, it conveys primarily something more or other than mere information, it is considered connotative, and emphasizes a subjective vision of reality. In Rome, open city, for example, the succession of two shots in which a prisoner is carried into a torture chamber by the SS and then is seen bleeding, is primarily informative in that the events adhere to what we accept as an objective historical reality. Conversely, when in two successive shots in Eight and a Half, Guido, the protagonist, first is kissing his wife with some feeling, and then is suddenly seen kissing his mother in an identical manner, we are confronted with what at best can be termed the subjective reality of an oedipal complex.

The duration of shots and of sound in film may also be considered in the same manner. Once again, in the simplest of terms, when these elements deviate from what we consider to be an objective representation of reality, then the subjectivity of the film is emphasized. The uncomfortably long shot of an artfully draped dead soldier in Visconti's The Leopard, thus goes beyond a simple consideration of the objective event (a dead soldier), and reveals to us Visconti's subjective preoccupation with beauty, regardless of the possible negative moral connotations implicit in the object when considered in these terms. The blasts of industrial sound which drown out several abortive conversations in Antonioni's Red Desert must also be seen as revealing something more than mere information of an objective

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

nature, and may perhaps be understood to be a commentary on the alienating nature of our technological world. (A consideration of the reevaluation of the image as objective correlative in realistic cinema has been deliberately omitted in oder to avoid confusion)

You may, of course, well argue that these random interpretations are unsubstantiated, and you would be quite correct, at least at this time and place. It should however be observed that they have been checked against the entire single works and against the directors' collected efforts and seem to be valid.

It would thus appear that the same kind of stylistic analysis which one can apply to literary works (in the written/spoken languages) in an attempt to penetrate what Jacobson has defined as the metalanguage (i.e.: that which is conveyed artistically beyond the science of concrete languages), may be equally applied to the study of film, thus, it is hoped, making available new tools whereby this new art form may be the object of legitimate scholarly, humanistic research.